COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

o. 18.] London, Saturday, 22d May, 1802. [Price 10D.

NTENTS.—Order issued at New Orleans, 577. Notice by Fr. Min. in Amer. 577. Addr. of Fr. Consuls to Legis. Body, 577. Delibe. respect. the Elec. of Buonaparté, 579. Buonaparté's Ans. 580. Decree respect. the Elec. for Life, 581. Pro. in Parl. on the Tr. of Amiens, 581. Let. on Gum Trade, 592. Answ. 597. Sum. Poli. 601.

PUBLIC PAPERS.

der issued by the Intendant of New Orleans, on the 1st of March, 1802.

" Notice is hereby given, that from the day of the blication of the general peace in this town, or ore, if the King should order it, the commerce ich at present exists with neutral powers, and granted the 11th of June, 1798, shall entirely se. American vessels shall still be admitted, and y deposit and carry away their property as they e done hitherto, according to the treaty of Octo- the 27th, 1795."

tice issued by the French Chargé-d'Affaires in the United States of America.

" The Commissary-General and Chargé d'Affaires the French Republic, gives information to all ons whom it may concern, that in consequence the revolt of the negroes in St. Domingo, all nner of intercourse is, by order of the Commander Chief of the French Republic in the island, hibited to foreigners, with any other part of the nd but the two ports of Cape François and Port ublicain. Cruisers will arrest all foreign vessels empting to enter any other port, and to commu- te with the revolted negroes, to carry either munition or provisions to them: such vessels ll be confiscated, and their commanders severely nished, as violating the rights of the French Re- blic, and the law of nations. Fair and regular ders will meet with encouragement and pro- ion at the above-mentioned places from the Ge- al in Chief and subordinate authorities. The rcourse between the United States and those ports is left open to the American trade. It be advisable for merchants to make shipments the colony, and who wish to meet with no erruption by incurring suspicion of improper con- t, to take certificates from the commissaries, commissarial agents of the French Republic in United States, who are instructed to deliver them he applicants.

" Given at George Town, Columbia District, the 27th Ventôse, 10th year of the French Republic (18th March, 1802.)

" L. A. PICHON."

dress to the Legislative Body of France, on the 6th of May, 1802, *when the Treaty of Amiens was communicated to them.*

" Citizens Legislators,

" The government addresses to you the treaty ch has put a final period to the dissentions of ope, and completed the great work of peace.

" The Republic combated for its independence— independence is recognized: the acknowledge- t of every power consecrates those rights which had held from nature, and those limits which she es from her victories.

" Another Republic has been established in her bosom, founded on the same principles, and drawing from the same source the ancient spirit of the Gauls. Attached to France by the remembrance of a common origin, by common institution, and above all, by the tie of benefits conferred, the *Italian Republic* takes rank amongst the powers of Europe, and amongst our allies, supported by courage and distinguished by virtue.

" The *Batavian Republic* is restored to a unity of interest: freed from that double influence which perplexed its councils, and distracted its politics, it has regained its independence, and finds in the nation which had conquered it, the most faithful guarantee of its existence and its rights. The wisdom of its administration will preserve its splendour, and the active economy of its citizens will restore prosperity.

" The *Helvetic Republic*, recognized without, is continually agitated within by factions, who dispute for power. Government, faithful to its principles, will not exercise over an independent nation any other influence than that of its councils: its councils have, however, hitherto been unheeded, but it still hopes that the voice of wisdom and moderation will be listened to, and that the neighbouring powers of Helvetia will not be compelled to interfere to put a stop to troubles which menace their own tranquility.

" It was due from the Republic to her engagements, and the fidelity of Spain, to make every effort to preserve the integrity of the territory of that kingdom. This duty she fulfilled throughout the negotiation, with all the energy which circumstances would allow. The King of Spain acknowledges the fidelity of his allies, and his generosity has made that sacrifice to peace which they endeavoured to spare him. He has acquired by this, new claims to the attachment of France, and a sacred title to the gratitude of Europe. Already the return of commerce consoles his states for the calamities of war, and soon a vivifying spirit will infuse into his vast possessions a new activity and a new industry.

" Rome, Naples, and Etruria, are restored to tranquillity, and the arts of peace.—Lucca has found rest and independence under a constitution which has destroyed all animosities, and united all hearts. Liguria has founded, on the consent of all parties, the principles of its organization; and Genoa again sees riches and commerce enter her ports. The Republic of the Seven Islands is still, as well as Helvetia, the prey of anarchy; but the Emperor of Russia, in concert with France, has ordered some troops which he had in Naples, to be transported thither, which will restore to those happy countries the only blessing which they want, viz. tranquillity, the destruction of faction, and the enforcement of the laws. Thus, from one extremity to the other, Europe sees peace restored upon the continent and upon the ocean, and its happiness founded upon the union of the great powers, and upon the faith of treaties.

" In America, the known principles of govern-

ment have afforded to Martinico, Tobago, and St. Lucia the most perfect security—they no longer dread those imprudent laws, which would spread devastation and death throughout the colonies.—Their only wish is to be united to the mother country, and they will bring back to it, with their attachment and confidence, a degree of prosperity at least equal to that which they before enjoyed. At St. Domingo great calamities have happened; great evils are to be repaired; but the insurrection grows less formidable every day: Toussaint, without fortresses, without treasure, without army, is no more than a chief of banditti, wandering from mountain to mountain, whom our light troops are constantly pursuing, and will soon destroy.

"The peace is known in the isle of France and in India; the first cares of government have already brought back their love of the Republic, their confidence in its laws, and afforded every hope of prosperity.

"Many years will pass over us without victories, without triumphs, without those splendid negotiations which fix the destiny of states; but another species of success ought to mark the existence of nations, and above all, that of the Republic. Industry is every where re-animated, and commerce and the arts every where unite to efface the calamities of war. Labour of every kind call for the attention of government. It will perform this new task with success, as it shall possess the confidence of the French people. The years which are to come, will be, it is true, less celebrated, but the happiness of France will increase, instead of her obtaining that glory which she would now despise.

(Signed) "BUONAPARTÉ,
"First Consul,
"H. B. MARET.
"Sec. of State."

Deliberation containing the Re-election of the First Consul of the French Republic. Extracted from the Registers of the Deliberations of the Conservative Senate, the 18th Floréal (May 8.)

The Senate, assembled to the number prescribed by the 60th article of the Constitutional Act;

Having seen the message of the Consuls of the Republic, transmitted by three Orators of the Government, relative to the peace between France and England;

After having heard its special commission, charged by its decree of the 16th of this month, to present its views respecting that expression of national gratitude, which the Senate is of opinion it ought to testify to the First Consul of the Republic;

Considering, that in the present situation of the Republic, it is the duty of the Conservative Senate to employ all the means that the constitution has placed in its power, to give to the government that stability which alone increases its resources, inspires confidence abroad, and establishes credit at home; encourages allies, and discourages secret enemies; banishes the evils of war, permits the fruits of peace to be enjoyed, and leaves wisdom time to execute all she can conceive for the happiness of a free people.

Considering, besides, that the Supreme Magistrate, who, after having so often conducted the Republican legions to victory, having delivered Italy, triumphed in Europe, Africa, and Asia, and filled the world with his renown, has preserved France from the horrors of anarchy which threatened her, has broken the revolutionary scythe, dispersed factions, extinguished civil discords and religious troubles, added order and security to the blessings of liberty, hastened the progress of the human mind, consoled mankind, and given peace both to the land and seas, has the greatest right to the gratitude of his fellow-citizens, as well as to the admiration of posterity.

That the wish of the tribunal, which the Senate has received in this day's sitting, may, in this case, be considered as that of the French nation;

That the Senate cannot express, in a more solemn way, to the First Consul, the gratitude of the nation, than by giving a marked proof of the confidence which the French people reposes in him;

Considering also, that the second and third Consuls have worthily seconded the glorious labours of the First Consul of the Republic;

From these considerations, and after the suffrages had been collected by ballot,

The Senate decrees as follows:

Art. I. The Conservative Senate, in the name of the French people, expresses its gratitude to the Consuls of the Republic.

II. The Conservative Senate re-elects Citizen Napoleon Buonaparté, First Consul of the French Republic, for the ten years which shall immediately follow the expiration of the ten years for which he has been named by the 39th article of the constitution.

III. The present *Senatus Consulte* shall be transmitted by a message to the Legislative Body, to the Tribunate, and to the Consuls of the Republic.

(Signed) TRONCHET, President.
CHASSET and SERRURIER, Secretaries.

Paris, 19th Floréal (May 9.)

Buonaparté, First Consul of the Republic, to the Conservative Senate.

Senators,

The honourable proof of esteem marked in your deliberation of the 18th (May 8th,) will be always engraved on my heart.

It was the suffrage of the people which invested me with the Chief Magistracy. I should not consider myself sure of possessing their confidence, if the act which was to retain me in that situation was not also sanctioned by the suffrages of the people.

In the three years which have last passed, fortune has smiled on the Republic; but fortune is inconstant, and how many men has she loaded with her favours, who have afterwards lived too long.

The interest of my glory and that of my happiness would appear to mark as the termination of my public life the moment that the peace of the world was proclaimed. But the glory and happiness of an individual citizen must be silent, when the interest of the state and the opinion of the public call upon him.

In your judgment, I ought to make a fresh sacrifice for the good of the people; I shall do, if the wish of the people commands, what your suffrage authorises me to do.

(Signed) BUONAPARTÉ.

By order of the First Consul,
H. B. MARET.

Decree of the 20th Floréal (May 10.)

The Consuls of the Republic, upon the reports of the ministers, having heard the Council of State; having seen the act of the Conservative Senate, of the 18th (8th May;) and the message of the First Consul to the Conservative Senate, dated the 19th (May 9th;) considering that the resolution of the First Consul is a distinguished homage paid to the sovereignty of the people; that the people, when consulted on their dearest interests, should know no other limits but those interests, decree what follows:

Art. I. The French people shall be consulted on this question; "Shall Napoleon Buonaparté be Consul for life?"

II. There shall be open in each commune, registers, in which the citizens shall be invited to mark their wish upon this question.

III. Those registers shall be open at the Secretary's Office in all the administrations, at the Clerks of all the Tribunals, and with all the Mayors and Notaries.

IV. The delay for voting in each department shall be three weeks, counting from the day that this decree shall arrive at the prefecture, and seven days from the day it shall be delivered to each commune.

V. The ministers are charged with the execution of the present decree, which is to be inserted in the Bulletin of the laws.

(Signed) CAMBACERES, 2d Consul.

By order of the 2d Consul,

H. B. MARET.

PROCEEDINGS IN PARLIAMENT.

On Thursday (May 13) the final consideration of the definitive treaty was brought forward in both Houses. In the House of Lords the subject was opened by *Lord Grenville*. To give even a faint sketch of his highly eloquent and argumentative speech is utterly impossible. No circumstance was left untouched upon; no argument unenforced. His lordship declared that it was not his intention to propose any thing like censure upon the framers of the treaty, or which tended to violate that treaty now the faith of the nation was pledged for the observance of it, but merely to point out the dangers to which the country was exposed. In performing this task his lordship entered into a minute investigation of the manner of the negotiation, and the terms on which it had been concluded. The old and wise forms of negotiation had, he contended, been departed from in the treaty now before the House. Much had been left in the preliminaries to be settled in the definitive treaty. In the interval between the two treaties, circumstances had taken place, which ought to have induced ministers to make the definitive treaty less unfavourable than the preliminaries. But this had not been attended to. Little was to be argued from the tone and temper of France in the negotiation, on which so much stress had been laid by ministers. The experience of the last six months, and the present hostile measures taken against our commerce by France sufficiently proved the real disposition of that country. His lordship then entered at large into the claims of the Prince of Orange, the situation of Portugal, the insecurity of our eastern possessions from the non-renewal of treaties, the ineffective neutrality of Malta, and the little regard paid to the interests of those British subjects possessing property in the restored colonies. Reverting again to the non-renewal of treaties his lordship pointed out the inconveniences which would result to the country from this omission. Those wise stipulations in the treaty of Utrecht, by which the agrandizement of France in the West-Indies and America was prevented, were now completely done away. The effect would also be equally injurious to our commerce, as we should immediately be deprived of the gum trade and the power of cutting logwood. That our sovereignty in India was full and complete was beyond a doubt; but it was of little consequence that we felt the justice of our rights; the thing to be considered was, whether they would not be contested by the enemy. An amicable negotiation ought, therefore, to be immediately entered into with France on that subject. Having, in conclusion, descanted upon the consequences of our having surrendered so many important stations and colonies, and the danger to be apprehended from the increased power of France, his lordship closed his speech by moving the address to his Majesty, of which a correct copy may be found in page 572 of the Register. The address was supported by the *Duke of Richmond*, *Earl Spencer*, and the *Earls of Carnarvon*, and *Darnley*. The *Earl of Roslin*, though adverse to the definitive treaty, declared himself unprepared to go to the full extent of the original motion. On the address being read the *Duke of Norfolk* rose to express his disapprobation of it, as tending to raise a doubt in France of our pacific intentions. In his opinion we ought not to think of entering into a war for some particular stations, or for such small spots as the island of Elba and others.

He therefore moved as an amendment that all after the second paragraph of the address should be left out. The address was opposed by *Lord Pelham* who was supported by *Lord Auckland, Lord Ellenborough*, the *Earl of Westmoreland*, the *Lord Chancellor, Lord Hobart, Lord Mulgrave*, and the *Earl of Camden*. In reply to the arguments urged by the opposite side of the House it was answered by ministers, that it was a mere assumption to say that whatever was restored to other countries was, in effect, given up to France; that the value of those possessions we had relinquished had been considerably overrated, that as to Malta the guaranteeing powers had a strong interest in its independence; that our rights to the gum trade and logwood cutting were unimpaired, that our sovereignty in India was incontestable; and that with respect to the accessions made by France since the preliminary articles, they were not deemed by ministers a sufficient ground for breaking off the negotiation. It was urged also by *Lord Mulgrave* that with respect to the island of Elba it might at any time be reduced by a competent force. The speech of *Lord Ellenborough* was of very considerable length agreeing in the points of defence with ministers, on whom he made a very animated panegyric, he added that it was wise in them not to insist upon the idle compliment of the flag, and that as to the treaties which had been so much dwelt upon, they were in reality, nothing better than mere waste paper.—An address to his Majesty, to the same effect as that brought forward in the lower House by *Lord Hawkesbury*, was then moved by *Lord Pelham*. It was carried by 122 votes against 16. A resolution was then moved by *Lord Holland*, the purport of which was that the omission of various opportunities of negotiation had led to such a state of affairs as to render the present peace necessary for the safety and preservation of the Empire, and to justify the important and painful sacrifices made to obtain it. The motion was negatived without a division.—The lords who voted in the minority on *Lord Grenville's* motion were, Duke of Richmond, Marquis of Buckingham; Earls, Carlisle, Warwick, Fitzwilliam, Darlington, Radnor, Spencer, Fortescue, Mansfield, Caernarvon, Carysfort; Lords, Kenyon, Grenville, Cawdor, Minto.

Nothing of importance came before the House of Lords on Monday, (17th) Tuesday (18th) or Wednesday (19th). Some bills were forwarded in their different stages and petitions received.

The discussion of the definitive treaty was brought forward in the House of Commons (Thursday, May 13) by *Mr. Windham*. He commenced a long, animated and highly interesting speech by a defence of the conduct which had been pursued by himself and his hon. friends with respect to the present treaty. Articles had been discussed separately to be judged jointly. He would, therefore, now go hastily over the different points which were to be the subject of debate. Commencing with the island of Malta he descanted with great force upon the weakness of the security which we possessed for the neutrality of that island, and the strange subversion of the principles on which the order of Malta was originally formed. Such was the subversion of principle that the German knights had refused to associate with an order which they considered as degraded. The Cape was the next object; and here there was a marked difference between the preliminary and the definitive treaty. By the former the option of its being a free port was left to England; it was by the latter conferred upon France. The Batavian Republic might put the Cape into the hands of France to-morrow, if she pleased, in which case we should have no port of refreshment in the voyage to India: the consequence of which would be that any troops we might send for the defence of our eastern possessions, would be disabled from acting for at least six weeks after their arrival, while France might make hostile preparations at the Cape and Cochin with the greatest ease, and act against our Indian territories before we were apprised of their intentions. It would perhaps be said that we might touch at the Brazils, but in the event of a war would not the ports of that country be shut against us. By the stipulations of the treaty we had placed France in a stipulation to command the Brazils. In the north we had given to France the possession of Louisiana. We had in fact given her the possession of a fourth part of the globe. The hon. gentleman then entered at length into the effect of the non-renewal of treaties, as affecting the security of our eastern possessions. It was not, he urged, sufficient to say that we had the absolute sovereignty in India. The question was, whether the French would not dispute that right in the field of battle. That we could, as had been said by an hon. gentleman, (Mr. Dundas) defend our sovereignty by force of arms was certain, but would it be prudent to do so, when we had given so many means of annoyance to France by our con-

sion of the Cape and Cochin? The question, however, would be settled in Europe not in India. The hon. gentleman then entered into a view of the power and the intentions of France, and the situation of the other states on the Continent. With respect to this country its insular situation was a general subject of consolation. It was said, "Europe is gone; peace be with her; but thank God we are islanders, we can take to our boat and go where we please." But was this the case! Where could we go that we should not meet with France? France had indefinite means of carrying on her projects. The two Continents were placed in the hands of France. He really believed that a great part of the approbation given to this peace had been bestowed from the fanciful idea that France occupied with her conquests would leave commerce and manufactures to us. But France had now plainly told us that such was not her intentions. The attacks lately made against our territories were now to be turned into attacks upon our commerce. The war of the custom-house succeeded to that of the sword; and this latter might he the most fatal of the two. The hon. gentleman then went into a detailed and luminous account of the origin of the war, the various opinions held concerning it, and the manner in which it had been supported. Much had been boasted, he said, of the exertions made by this country during the war; but he for one thought that it had not made all those exertions which were demanded by the magnitude of the object at stake. Much too had been said of the ruinous tendency of the late war, though commerce had increased almost beyond calculation; and much of the public distress, though the public opulence had never before been so extraordinary. After having recapitulated and placed in fresh points of view the various arguments he had urged in the course of his speech the hon. gentleman concluded by moving an address to his Majesty in the same words as the address moved by *Lord Grenville*, in the House of Lords, and which will be found in the Register, p. 572.

The motion was supported by *Lord Folkestone*. *Lord Hawkesbury* then rose, and in a speech of great length opposed the motion. He began by a sketch of the state of Europe at the time that his Majesty's ministers were first appointed. Our ally, the Emperor, had at that time lost a battle, and shortly after made a treaty which left us to combat single handed, not only with France, but with a powerful confederacy formed by her influence. Peace was called for by all ranks of people. No treaty of ours could then settle the affairs of the Continent, and we had therefore only to provide for our own safety, interest, and honour, by securing our allies, by maintaining the complete integrity of the British empire, and by obtaining such equivalents from our conquests as might balance the power of France. He would not enter into a discussion of the preliminaries, he would only say, that the objects wished for had been attained. The noble lord declared that though he regretted several things which had happened since that period, he did not think we should have been justified in breaking off the negotiation. With regard to Italy, the powers of Europe had testified their acquiescence in the arrangements which had taken place in that quarter. As to the present value of Louisiana, it was at present almost nothing, and so far from laying America at the feet of France, was more likely to unite her closer to us, by exciting her jealousy of that power. In the definitive treaty two faults, those of omission and commission, had been discovered. The first related to the non-renewal of treaties. To have renewed former treaties would, he contended, have been impolitic, as we should have been bound by them, while other nations would have been under no engagement, as we must have renewed contradictory stipulations, and have, in fact, given our sanction to the encroachments of France. Commercial treaties could not have been renewed without renewing stipulations extremely disadvantageous to ourselves. Nor had our trade been less flourishing without than with them. Prohibitions of our manufactures could not be carried into effect, as the advantage would be on the side of this country, who would suffer more by our exclusion of her wines and brandy, than we should by her exclusion of our manufactures. The noble lord then replied to the arguments which had been urged with regard to the cutting of logwood and the gum trade, our right to which, he contended, remained unaffected. The right of the flag remained also in force notwithstanding our having declined to assert it with regard to a particular and weak power. The noble lord then entered into a discussion of those points in which the definitive treaty was argued to have deviated from the preliminary articles. These he should consider under five heads. The first related to prisoners of war. The stipulations in this case

were such as were laid down by the best writers on the law of nations, and by the wisest men. The next was Portugal, and here the noble lord contended, that we had not only done all that was required from us by good faith, but even more. With regard to Newfoundland, which had been mentioned, every thing was left there as before the war, and the stipulations concerning the Cape of Good Hope were, in the opinions of the best informed people, better than those contained in the preliminaries. Malta, it had originally been the wish of ministers to place under the protection of Russia, but that power had declined the offer. Naples, though not so efficient a protector as might have been wished had a strong interest in securing Malta, as had likewise Austria. The formation of a Maltese *langue* was a step which was in justice due to the inhabitants of the island for their distinguished spirit and bravery in the warfare they had carried on against the French. The peace we had made was, he would assert, better than the continuance of the war, without the prospect of any adequate advantage. There was one subject which gentlemen seemed to have studiously laid out of their consideration, it was the great increase of our power by the conquest of the Mysore, and the additional value which had been acquired by our West-India colonies, to which we had added the large and fertile Island of Trinidad. France had, it was true, acquired a large extent of territory, but without strength or resources, while Great-Britain had a capital that stood in need even of more territory to employ it upon. As to the policy of France we had as much to dread from her under the Bourbons as under the present power. Her ambitious views would always be the same. Though a friend to the preliminaries, he could not approve of the exultation which had been shewn in the country upon their signing: it was an exultation which he should have been sorry to have seen at the conclusion of any peace. He closed his speech by moving,

"That an humble address be presented to his Majesty, to return his Majesty the Thanks of the House for having been graciously pleased to communicate to them the Definitive Treaty of Peace, to represent to his Majesty, that we have already declared our full approbation of the Preliminary Articles of Peace, which, by his Majesty's command, were laid before this House, and we are satisfied that his Majesty has, on the whole, wisely consulted the interests of his people in having concluded a Definitive Treaty, founded on the basis of these Preliminaries. That although we deeply lament the calamitous events which have taken place on the Continent of Europe in the course of the war, we cannot reflect but with the utmost satisfaction, that the wild and destructive designs with which this country was threatened at its commencement, have been effectually frustrated. That his Majesty's Dominions have not only been preserved entire, but valuable and important acquisitions have been annexed to them; that our commercial and maritime superiority have been maintained and improved, and that we continue in the confirmed possession of those means of exertion which the experience of the late contest has proved more than ever to be equal, even amidst the new and unexampled difficulties of other nations of Europe, to maintain the independence, and assert the honour of this country; that impressed with these sentiments, we are on our parts earnestly solicitous to cultivate and improve the blessings of peace, and to concur in such measures as his Majesty in his wisdom shall judge to be best calculated to prevent occasions of misunderstanding with Foreign Powers; that we rely on his Majesty's known disposition to adhere with the most scrupulous fidelity to his engagements; but that we entertain at the same time a perfect confidence that his Majesty will not fail to employ that vigilance and attention which the present situation of Europe demands; and above all that his Majesty will uniformly determine and prepare to defend against every encroachment, the great sources of the wealth, commerce, and naval power of the Empire. That we are fully persuaded his Majesty's faithful subjects will at all times be ready to support the honour of his Majesty's Crown, and the rights, laws, and liberties of their Country, with the same zeal, energy, and fortitude which they have invariably manifested during the war, now happily brought to a conclusion."

Mr. Dundas after explaining some part of what had fallen from him on a former night, declared that, though he could never have consented to set his hand to the giving up possessions of such vast importance as the Cape of Good Hope and Malta, he agreed on the whole with the amendment, because the original address opened with an invective against the peace, from which no good could be expected. Lord Hawkesbury was answered at great length and with great force of argument by *Mr. T. Grenville*, who denied that the public approbation of the peace had been such as was stated by the noble lord. The people he said were ready to stand forward in defence of their honour and security, and had been equally so at the termination of the war. It was now moved by *General Gascoyne* that the debate should be adjourned. This was objected to by *Mr. Pitt* and the *Chancellor of the Exchequer*, who declared, however, that if it was the wish of any considerable number of the members, they would not object to it. On the question being put the adjournment was carried by 187 votes against 135.

The debate of the next day (Friday, May 14,) was long and animated. Nearly the same ground, however, was taken as on the preceding day. On the address and amendment having been read from the chair, *Sir W. Young* rose, and in a short speech stated his objections to the definitive treaty. The dependence of Malta, the cession of Louisiana and part of St. Domingo, and the non-renewal of former treaties were dwelt upon by him with considerable force and effect. He was followed by *Lord Castlereagh*, who in a long speech defended every part of the treaty. The change that took place in Italy during the negotiation was not, he argued, such as ought to have induced the ministers to come to a rupture with France. It in reality did not endanger our security. The cession of Louisiana was certainly an object of more importance, but the chance of its affecting our interest at some future period was not a sufficient reason to prevent a peace from being concluded. The extension of the French limits in Guiana had been much insisted on, but he must confess it appeared to him that this question was not of such importance as it had been represented. The Arowary was too far from the Amazons to command its entrance. The noble lord entered at some length into the arrangements relative to Malta which he contended were fully sufficient to ensure its independence. The object of the war had, he said, been general security, and this we had attained. That the French influence on the Continent was great, no one would deny, but it was not a matter of alarm, and it was his firm opinion that nothing would tend more to reduce it than restoring her colonies to France. Still less alarm did he feel from French prohibitions on our commerce. The noble lord then went into a calculation to prove that it would be utterly impossible for France to injure our manufactures or commerce; and after defending the policy of ministers in permitting the sailing of the French armament to St. Domingo, concluded by declaring his approbation of the amendment. He was followed on nearly the same topics by *General Maitland* and the *Master of the Rolls*—*Earl Temple*, and *Dr. Laurence* went over all the points which had before been urged by Mr. Windham, and enforced them with great ability. The *Chancellor of the Exchequer* then rose, and declaring that in the exhausted state of the House, he would not intrude upon it for any considerable time, proceeded to defend the various articles of the treaty. His arguments were necessarily a repetition of what had been before advanced by Lord *Hawkesbury* and others, with some few additions. From the improvement which had taken place in copper bottoming our vessels, little danger was to be apprehended from the cession of Louisiana and Florida to France, as "our trade might now pass through "the windward passage instead of the "Gulph of Mexico." As to the extent of territorial power acquired by France, it was assuredly a matter of regret; but we had not the power of controlling it; "we "were not to presume to say the bounty "of Providence was to be dispensed in the "way that was most consonant to our "wishes." Under all the circumstances he would ask if this treaty was not such as ought to be approved. "He had never "thought of this treaty, nor of the prelimi-"nary articles, with any sentiment of exul-"tation; he had satisfied himself, and he re-"mained saisfied, that it was upon the whole "the best measure that could be taken—he "had never endeavoured to paint it in false "colours—he had never attempted to apply "to it any epithets of praise." He was convinced, however, that it had not tarnished the honour of the country. Without meaning it as an article of accusation he believed that the speeches and conduct of gentlemen in that House had affected the inhabitants of the metropolis, and that this had appeared both at St. James's and the Stock Exchage; but he was still convinced that the mass of the people hailed the peace as a blessing. He concluded by hoping, that with a system of firmness and conciliation, those blessings might be long preserved. *Mr. Sheridan* rose at two o'clock, and commenced a speech which was characterized throughout by the most exquisite wit and humour. He commenced by mentioning in strong terms of approbation the conduct of the hon. member (Mr. Windham) who had originally moved the address, and of those friends who acted with him. They had acted with honour, consistency, and English spirit in the steps they had taken, and he thanked them for exposing as they had done the terms of that peace. Against that peace, however, it was not his intension to call for any vote of censure, as he was fully persuaded it was the only peace to be expected from such a war. The war had been carried on for the purpose of obtaining indemnity and security, and he thought that the two islands we had obtained ought to have some name descriptive of the objects for which we had contended. The one might be called *Indemnity*

and the other *Security* Island. It was not long ago that Buonaparté was represented as the child and champion of Jacobinism, and the power of France was held forth as terrible and dangerous in the highest degree. Now all was changed: Buonaparté was become the extirpator of Jacobinism, and the power of France was no subject of fear. Buonaparté had returned to penitence and piety. From such penitence and piety he heartily prayed that this kingdom might be preserved. But should there still be any danger from the power of Buonaparté a noble lord had a remedy at hand. Buonaparté, says he, is a rough man with a sword in his hand, but put him behind a counter and he will be the most tractable of beings! Give him his West-India colonies, and there is nothing to fear. Such a promising plan would, he hoped, the hon. gentleman said, be supported by a liberal subscription. A right hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Pitt) would willingly wave the honour of his statue for the benefit of his country, and apply the subscription to the setting up of Buonaparté. Not that the sacrifice would be a very great one, as many difficulties had occurred about the raising of that statue. The bank had no gold for the purpose. Some people, indeed, were of opinion that *papier machée* would be a very appropriate material. The hon. gentleman then commented in a vein of happy humour upon the connection which seemed to subsist between the present and the late ministry. The present Chancellor of the Exchequer was like a driver upon the coach box who was perpetually turning to a passenger upon the roof, to know how he was to handle the reins, and which way he was to turn. The ministry now in office reminded him of a story in Aristophanes, in which Hercules was represented as going to the infernal regions to release Theseus, who had remained so long there, that he had grown to his seat. After much exertion Hercules contrived to drag Theseus from this situation, but not without leaving behind him a portion of the sitting part. So the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, after many hard tugs had been forced from his seat, but like Theseus he had left behind him a part of what it was unnecessary to name. After proceeding in this strain for a considerable time, the hon. gentleman concluded by moving an amendment of the same purport as that brought forward by Lord Holland in the House of Lords. On the original address, it was negatived by 278 votes against 22, including tellers.

That proposed by *Mr. Sheridan* was negatived without a division. *Lord Hawkesbury's* was then put and carried.—The names of the minority on *Mr. Windham's* motion are as follows: Lord Folkestone, Lord Morpeth, Lord Bruce, Lord Kensington, Sir Watkin Williams Wynne, Bart. Sir Wm. Young, Bart. Hon. T. Grenville, Hon. C. Dundas, Messrs. Windham, C. Wynne, Elliot, Baker, S. Poyntz, Ellis, G. Ellis, Folgambe, Camberline, B. Cooke, Dr. Laurence, and General Lennox. Tellers, Lord Temple and General Gascoyne.

Very little was done in the House on Monday (May 17). After the ordinary business was dispatched the order of the day was read, and the House resolved itself into a committee on the subject of the Sinking Fund. Some conversation took place in the committee between the *Chancellor of the Exchequer*, *Mr. Pitt*, *Mr. Boyd*, and *Mr. Tierney* on the subject of the comparative merits of the plan now before the House, with the original plan of the Sinking Fund.

The transactions of the two following days were equally unimportant.

TO THE EDITOR.

Gum Trade.

Sir,

I have read your answer to my letter of the 6th of May (Register, p. 548) with that attention which it deserves; and, having weighed it, find no cause to alter the opinion therein expressed. Referring to what I wrote (*hastily* I confess, but I trust not inaccurately) you will find, that on the question concerning the supposed abrogation of all treaties prior to that, which ministers have now concluded, I pronounced no judgment. Thinking it, as I still do, a point very dubious, and capable of being supported on either side with much plausibility, I declined entering into the discussion, and hoped to hear it argued by more experienced advocates. The reason of my alluding to this subject was, that, whereas our right to the gum trade appeared to me to have rested before the war upon two points, namely, our former sovereignty in Senegal, from which in this respect we had never departed, and the confirmation of our right in 1783, by the acknowledgment of France, I chose to wave whatever assistance my ar-

guments might have derived from this confirmation, and to rest entirely upon our unceded right. But willing as I was to suppose the abrogation of this acknowledgment, I thought it necessary to premise, that it did not rest upon clear and indisputable grounds. That, which I added in allusion to the declaration of 1783, was mentioned as a circumstance perhaps of curious observation, certainly not of very important weight. But, nugatory as you have been pleased to style it, permit me to assert, that it was not inaccurate. By what grammatical system you have been led to imagine, that *existing treaties* must signify *treaties, which do not exist*, but *have existed*, I must in my turn "confess, that I am at a loss to "discover." You must allow, that such interpretation, though useful to the subtle arguer, would tend to confuse our notions of the past and present. With respect to the question, upon which this remark was made, I am not disposed at present to enter into it; but waving it, as I did before, shall examine your objections to my opinion on the gum trade, which I do not despair of answering to your satisfaction. That much has been given up by the late treaty, that more has been thrown in doubt by the uncertainty of its terms, is a fact, I fear, indisputable; but to point out what yet remains to Great-Britain, what her ministers ought to vindicate, and with a little firmness may yet preserve, is a task, even if fruitless, not uninteresting. I speak, as you justly observe, "of what France has a right to do, "not of what she will do;" for the measure of her usurpations will not be determined by the justice or injustice of her pretensions, but by the vigour or pusillanimity of her opponents. These are the only limits of her encroachments, and the constant objects of her politic discernment; and, if our ministers had resolution enough to enforce our claims, the decree excluding foreigners from the trade of Senegal, in which the British name is not, I believe, expressed, would be interpreted by her as alluding to those only, whom she had a right to exclude. If we tamely submit to all her usurpations, the vigilant ambition of the Corsican Consul will circumscribe us on every direction, will watch all our motions, and thwart our operations in every corner of the globe.

"Vigilat Consul, vexillaque vestra coercet;
Hic novus ——, ignobilis, et modò ——
Municipalis eques, galeatum ponit ubique
Præsidium attonitis, et in omni gente laborat."

To my observations, on the present right of Great-Britain to carry on the gum trade on the coast between Portendic and the St. John, you have taken two exceptions; 1st. that it was not reserved by Great-Britain at the time of the cession of Senegal, but afterwards granted to her by France; 2dly. that, if it was so reserved, the right, upon which that reservation was founded, is annulled by the abrogation of the treaty of 1763.

On the first of these exceptions, which, if true, would be conclusive, you are "not "inclined to lay much stress;" probably because you feel some fallacy in the arguments, which support it. You contend, that this was not a reservation, but a subsequent grant, because it is contained in an article, which (though in the same treaty) is in order subsequent to that, by which Senegal was ceded to France; and you add, that another article intervenes upon a different subject, which statement to me appears inaccurate. In adjusting the rights of Britain and France upon the western coast of Africa, there were two important points, the slave trade, and the gum trade. The ninth article of the treaty of Versailles delivers Senegal, which supplied both these branches of commerce, into the hands of France; the tenth secures to Great-Britain her slave trade by the guarantee of Fort James, and the eleventh secures her gum trade by stipulating for free access for that purpose to a part of the dependencies of Senegal. In this I discover no interruption of the subject, but on the contrary a clear and continued connexion. I know, Sir, the extent of your information on these subjects to be considerable, and I am certain, you cannot be ignorant, that Vattel, whom you have quoted, has * ably demonstrated, that the whole of every treaty, though subdivided into several articles, is to be considered as one article; that there is a reciprocalness in its parts and engagements, which preclude their separation. One stipulation is made by the party, to whom it is detrimental, in contemplation of another, which is advantageous to him, without which the former might never have received his assent; and on this account the whole is to be considered as one article, though subdivided for the sake of greater distinctness. It appears then according to the opinion of

* See Vattel, B. II. Sect. 202. and B. IV. Sect. 40. and Grotius therein quoted.

the most approved civilians, that, even if the connexion, which I have stated, between the above-mentioned articles had not existed, they must have been inseparably joined by the unity of the treaty; and of course that the stipulation in the eleventh article must act as a reservation on the cession in the ninth. Upon these grounds, and the premises in my former Letter, I contend, as before, that France held Senegal subject to certain British rights, and that the same estate, which she possessed there, is now restored to her.

Whether those rights can be annulled by the supposed abrogation of the treaty of 1763, remains to be examined. You have suggested, that whatever rights we had must have originated in the treaty of Paris, and that, by omitting to renew that treaty, we have forfeited our title; but I believe, you was not aware to what lengths that opinion would lead you. You probably did not reflect, that, maintaining this proposition, you must assert, that Canada, that Cape Breton, and Nova Scotia are surrendered by the peace to France, that Jamaica is now the property of Spain. All these, and others, which it would be vain to enumerate, conquered, like Senegal, by the arms of Britain, were ceded to her afterwards by treaties, which we have now omitted to renew. But where is the man so wild in his opinions, so extravagant in his arguments as to insist, that by this omission we have surrendered all our ancient acquisitions, and reduced ourselves within the narrow limits of the British coast? Our sovereignty in Senegal was acquired by conquest in 1758, and that sovereignty was acknowledged by France in the treaty of 1763; and, if conquest is not a title, I may be bold to say, that there is no title to sovereignty in Europe, none perhaps in the habitable world. By "the law of "nature, which is the necessary law of na-"tions," all acquisitions in a just war are good in the eyes of God and man; and who is he, that will venture to proclaim, that the war, in which we conquered Senegal, arising from the intricate confusion of unadjusted claims, was unnecessary or unjust? Great and glorious I know it was to the arms of Britain, nor have I ever found, that honour and honesty disclaimed her pretensions. That our rights over Senegal were derived solely from the treaty of 1763, was not admitted in my Letter, which expressly stated, that Great-Britain held them by virtue of her conquest in 1758.

But, though I think the title by conquest paramount to that obtained by a subsequent treaty, I will further contend, that a cession by treaty gives a valid title for ever; which can be forfeited only by an infringement of some stipulation in the treaty, which conferred it; a case of forfeiture however, which will not occur; for what belligerent powers ever avowed their own trespasses, and who shall decide upon the justice of their cause? I shall be told, that, if the right is founded on treaty, it cannot exist without the treaty; but the fact is, that the right is given by the delivery, and the treaty is the evidence of that delivery, which may be lost without ejecting the possessor. If it were otherwise, this absurdity would follow, that a cession without treaty by the simple act of delivery would be a better and surer title than one confirmed by seal and signature. For instance, if in full peace Great-Britain had voluntarily surrendered the Falkland Islands to Spain, she never could have renewed her claims to them; if she had in addition to this expressed that surrender in a written convention, the future omission of Spain to renew this, would according to your argument have amounted to a forfeiture, and the rights of Great-Britan would have revived. Believing therefore, still, that the trade in Senegal accrued to us in 1758, was confirmed to us in 1763, was not ceded by the peace of Versailles, and will remain to us after the restoration of our late conquest, I thought it necessary to write thus much in vindication of my former arguments; and I trust, you will agree with me, that against the encroaching and tyrannous ambition of France we should "cavil on the ninth part of a hair." Much has been yielded to her imperious will; but neither the cession of important stations, nor the mighty continental preponderance of France, has rendered this treaty so dishonorable and insecure, as the uncertain predicament in which it has left us; "Quod "in ambiguo verbum jaculata reliquit." In this dangerous hour let Britain act with honesty, but with firmness; let her maintain inviolate her public faith, which has been too little regarded in the late transactions; but let not her ministers unnecessarily concede one iota of her ancient dignities, her ancient rights and commercial privileges. If they do, it is a jest to say, that they have consulted for the integrity of the British empire; for what greater or richer dominion did Britain ever possess, than the

re respect of Europe, and the valuable rces of her commercial wealth!

I am, Sir,
Yours, &c.
W. H.

y 16, 1802.

TO W—— H——.

Sir,

I do assure you, that I was not aware t there was any subtlety in observing, t the words "*existing treaties*," as made e of by the negotiators of the peace of ersailles, mean the *treaties which existed before the war*, and which had ceased to ex- from the commencement of that war, cause I then conceived it, and I now conive it, to be absolutely impossible that y could mean any other treaties; for, if y had meant treaties existing at the moent when they were speaking, to talk of e necessity of *renewing* those treaties, and the confusion that would arise from not newing them, would have been a downht absurdity.

The two exceptions which, in my former ter (Register, p. 548), I took to your obvations respecting our right to carry on gum trade, I should have heartily reced to see removed; but, after having ven your arguments that attention to hich they are entitled, I am sorry to find thing to alter my opinion with respect to her of those exceptions.

As to the doctrine of the reciprocity d unity of treaties, it is too evidently r and necessary to be questioned; but I really at a loss to perceive how the word *rty*, in the treaty of 1783, can, by the knowledgment of this doctrine, be conued to signify *reservation*. This point l, perhaps, be more fully illustrated by examination of the arguments which oppose to my second exception.

You wish, I perceive, not to rest our ht to the sovereignty of Senegal (and, of rse, our *reservation* of a part of that ht, if it be a reservation) on the cession 1763, but on the *conquest* of 1758. Far it from me to deny, that conquest gives ght of sovereignty; but, Sir, I trust it not require any appeal to civilians to vince you, that, when the conqueror obs a cession of his conquest, the nature his tenure is completely changed, and right of sovereignty rests solely upon ty. I do not, however, regard this as g at all material to the point in ques; because the right of conquest must be abandoned the moment the territory is, no matter by what means, in possession of another. We return, then, to the treaty of 1763, to which source, if to any, we must trace the reservation (if it be one) made in the treaty of 1783. The treaty of 1763 is, in my opinion, abrogated by the omissions in the treaty of Amiens, and of course, the reservation is abrogated, and our right to carry on the gum trade has, accordingly, ceased. In reply to this you ask, if I am aware of the lengths to which this opinion would carry me; and you proceed to state, that if my opinion on this point be correct, the abrogation of the treaty of 1763 deprives us of the right of sovereignty in Canada, Cape Breton, and Nova Scotia; and that, by pariety of reasoning, Jamaica now belongs to Spain. The Master of the Rolls, in answer to Messrs. Windham and Grenville, adopted precisely this sort of reasoning, the sophistry of which, give me leave to say, every one perceived but the learned gentleman himself. No, Sir, though I contend, that our reservation of the gum trade is done away by the abrogation of the treaty of 1763, if not by the abrogation of the treaty of 1783, I am not absurd enough to allow that our right to Canada, &c. is at all impaired by that abrogation. Treaties and parts of treaties cease the moment they are *fully executed*. Canada was not only ceded but taken possession of. The stipulation was executed, and it ceased. But, if France had, by the same treaty, reserved to herself the right of trading to Quebec, such a stipulation would have been *unexecuted* at the breaking out of the war of 1783, when, according to the opinion given in my former letter, it would have ceased. The stipulation respecting the cession of Senegal, contained in the treaty of 1763, was fully executed, and it ceased. But, if you attempt to resuscitate any part of its provisions, the late abrogation follows it as the shadow follows the substance. The conclusion I aim at is this; that you must found our right to carry on the gum trade either on the conquest of 1758, or on the treaties of 1763, or 1783; if you rest on the right of conquest, that right is gone the moment you lose possession of the territory; if you rest on either of the treaties, they also are now become of non-effect.

I am,
Sir,
Yours, &c.
Wm. Cobbett.

Pall-Mall, May 21, 1802.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

Paris, May 12.—Yesterday Citizen Lacuéye presented to the Legislative Body the new plan for recruiting the army. Sixty thousand men are to be raised from the conscriptions of the years 9 and 10, who are to be immediately embodied to supply the places of those discharged and thus to complete the peace establishment. Sixty thousand are likewise to be inscribed and organised to form a reserve that may be immediately called out if it should be necessary to place the army upon the war establishment. Citizen Lacuéye made a long speech, in which he pointed out the necessity of keeping up a strong military force in time of peace, and of being prepared to take the field with advantage if the war should be renewed.

The Legion of Honour about to be established is to consist of about 6000 men.

This Legion is to be divided into 15 Cohorts, each of which is to have its peculiar station.

Each Cohort shall consist of seven great officers, 20 commandants, 30 subaltern officers, and 350 privates.

The pay to be as follows:—to each great officer, 5000 francs per annum, and during life.

To each commandant, 2000 ditto.

To each subaltern, 1000 ditto.

To each private, 250 ditto—all for life.

Every individual, on his being admitted into the legion, shall swear, on his conscience and his honour, that he means to devote his existence to the welfare of the Republic, to the preservation of its territory (in its integrity), to the defence of its government, its laws, and the property, which it has rendered sacred; to oppose, by all means which justice, reason, and the laws authorize, every undertaking which may tend to the restoration of feudal system, of titles and immunities attached to them; in fine, to exert his best and most strenuous efforts for the maintenance of liberty and equality.

The First Consul is, *de jure*, the chief of the legion and president of the Great Council of Administration.

The conditions required for being admitted are, to have received arms of honour from the hands, or by order of the First Consul; to have rendered essential service in the war of liberty, either in the field or in the cabinet. In time of peace, a candidate must prove that he has served twenty-five years. Each year in time of war tells for two; each campaign of the republican war tells for four years.

May 14.—The people of this metropolis are eagerly signing the lists, which are opened for collecting the suffrages choosing Buonaparté Consul for life. There never was greater unanimity on any subject, since the first meeting of the States General.

The following is a translation of a hand-bill circulated throughout Paris, since the 13th inst.

"It is proposed to the French people to nominate Buonaparté Consul for life; has the importance of the services which he has rendered us been well considered, and is this recompense sufficient? Is it not the interest of every Frenchman to prevent the return of revolutionary sufferings, to annihilate anarchy for ever, and to avoid, in future, the intrigues of those partisans who promote and excite re-elections? When a state without constitution is only governed by the caprices of its kings, hereditary right may be dangerous; but when a government, equally wise and powerful, is organized, when a man, equally extraordinary and surprising, compels it to be respected and esteemed, when the whole world unanimously acknowledges his rights to the sovereign power, is not the right of inheritance necessary, and ought not the gratitude of the French *to fix it in the family of their hero?* In short, is not France, upon recovering its ancient limits, sufficiently extensive to honour herself with the title of *Empire?* and where, in the pages of history, shall we find an Emperor sufficiently magnanimous to be compared with the Titus who governs her? I submit these questions to my countrymen—they induce me to express my own wish.—I desire that the French people may proclaim Napoleon Buonaparté first *Emperor of the Gauls*, and fix in his family the hereditary power, upon re-establishing the Salic Law.

(Signed) "BONNEVILLE AYRAL,
"Chief of Battalion of the
"14th of the Line."

Paris, the 22d Floréal, Year 10.

Berne, May 6.—Fresh troubles have broken out in several of the Cantons. The peasants have riotously assembled for the purpose of destroying the title deeds of the landholders, and generally all records of every description. The French troops have marched against them, and there have been several skirmishes. The insurgents have

however, succeeded in their attempts to a very great extent. They have released the prisoners and burnt the titles and other records in a great number of places. In short the whole of this unhappy country exhibits a most shocking scene of distraction, pillage, and murder.

May 9.—We are informed, that a new constitution for Helvetia, similar to that of 20th of May, 1801, recommended by the French government, is about to be adopted.

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

The debates in Parliament, on the Definitive Treaty of Peace, have furnished a subject of commentary for the news-papers and the nation during the last week. The ministerial papers (the True Briton and the Sun) have repeated the sentiments and language of Lords Hawkesbury, Castlereagh, Pelenborough, and Mr. Dundas; they have, without any attempt at argument, echoed the assertions of those orators, and have rather improved upon Mr. Dundas's accusation against Lord Grenville and Mr. Windham, which, of course, extends to all those who voted with them. Let Mr. Dundas look at the list of the minorities on this occasion; let him compare their characters and their past parliamentary conduct with the characters and conduct of himself and his adherents, and, then, let him, after due reflection, say whether they merit the name of "*a* CONFEDERACY *for the purpose of supplanting the present Ministers.*" Of all men living Mr. Dundas is, perhaps, the very last who ought to have preferred this accusation. He has, however, thrown down the gauntlet, and shame on the poltroon who is afraid to take it up. We shall, on some future occasion, enter into an examination of his consistency, and, perhaps, we shall not pass over in silence his merits as a minister of war.

The discussion of the treaty has been productive of great good: it has shown the world, that if we have the misfortune to have a weak administration, we are not destitute of men, capable of seeing and exposing its weakness; it has drawn from the Ministers a confession of the badness of the terms of the treaty, and of the state of insecurity in which we are placed; it has extorted from them a declaration that they will make no further concessions to the violence and rapacity of France; it has bound them down to a defence of what still remains to us, and, which is more than all the rest, it has awakened the nation to a due sense of its danger and of its present disgrace.

The Ministers affect to regard the *votes*, on this occasion, as the only standard of the public opinion. If so, how comes it that the funds have experienced such a serious depression, notwithstanding the loads of capital, which the peace has left dead in the hands of the merchants and ship-owners? Mr. Addington acknowledged, that the motions of his antagonists had produced a sensible impression at both ends of the town; but observed, that this impression would be done away by the result of the discussion. Has it been done away? Mr. Addington further observed, that the country *in general* still hailed the peace as a blessing. If he had said the *ignorant mob* of the country, we should have been the last in the world to contradict him; but we venture to affirm, that of the sense and property of the country, nine-tenths are opposed to the peace. The ministerial prints informed the world, that as soon as Peace was proclaimed, addresses of thanks were "to pour in from *all parts* of the kingdom." Where are those addresses? The city of London has, indeed, addressed their Sovereign on the occasion; but was not the language of that address so cold, as to the peace itself, as to amount to a tacit condemnation of the measure? It is said that the city of York has presented an address; but it has been brought up with as much secrecy as if it had been a petition for a pension. The county of Berks have held a meeting at *Reading*, where the address was moved and seconded by two persons who had openly *reprobated* the conditions even of the Preliminaries! These gentlemen were of opinion, that, since the evil was without a remedy, it behoved them to endeavour to disguise it; an opinion to which, though we think it erroneous, the momentary support of the Minister is certainly to be ascribed. But, how has it happened, that the ministerial commentators on the debates, have not obliged the world with some reasons for *Mr. Pitt's silence* during the whole course of this long and most interesting and momentous discussion? Was it, that his eloquence was become unpopular in the House? was it that Lord Castlereagh possessed greater abilities than himself? or was it that he wisely resolved not to stake his reputation on a measure, which he foresaw would, first or last, be universally condemned?

The very important Bill relative to the

Non-residence of the Clergy, &c. stands for discussion next week. Never was a subject of more general concern submitted to the consideration of Parliament. It is, as to our domestic state, of full as much importance as the treaty with France is as to our foreign relations. It presents one of those cases, in which necessity is at war with a maxim universally acknowledged and with long established law. To decide on this case, with justice both to the priesthood and the people, requires nothing short of an union of all the wisdom, the impartiality, and the piety of the nation.

As if it were to throw ridicule on this great and serious question, the Puritans are pestering the Parliament with petitions for a law to prohibit *Bull-baiting*. Gloomy and factious as they have already rendered the poorer classes of the people, they are not content with their gradual success, but come boldly forward to invoke the aid of the Legislature to their insidious and destructive efforts. Those who are acquainted with the character of the Honourable Gentleman, by whom the matter in question has been introduced, will want no suggestion of ours to make them perceive that he has been deceived. He certainly imagines, that he is espousing the cause of order and morality; but, should his endeavours be crowned with success, he will, when it is too late, find that he has been labouring in the vineyard of faction and fanaticism.

By turning to the Public Papers, p. 577, it will be perceived, that the Intendant at New Orleans has issued an order, prohibiting the commerce of neutrals, after the peace shall be proclaimed, making an exception with respect to the Americans, who, by treaty, have a right to enter, and deposit their goods in, that port. When Mr. Addington and his supporters were arguing, that Louisiana would be of no value to France *now*, because it was of no value to her *formerly*, they certainly were not aware of the altered state of New Orleans, and we much question if they knew any thing at all about that port. This order of the Spanish Intendant reminds us, too, of a circumstance which is of great importance, but which we ourselves had overlooked in our remarks on the cession of Louisiana. We had observed, that the American settlements, on the banks of the Mississippi, would be placed under the absolute controul of France by her having the command of the river; but we neglected to state, that, by the treaty between the United States and Spain, the Americans are permitted to have factories at New Orleans without which, indeed, the navigation of the river would be of little use to them. Thus, then, when France has once entered on her new cession, not only the command of the only outlet for the American produce will be in her hands, but she will hold the produce itself, as a security for the good behaviour of its owners! And yet there are men, members of Parliament, yea, and statesmen too, who believe that the cession of Louisiana to France will tend to *estrange* the United States from her influence! Gracious God! and is it to men like these that we are to look for the salvation of England?

Another document, which will also be found in p. 577, informs us, that the French have, as we predicted they would, taken effectual measures for preventing Toussaint and his adherents from receiving succours from the American States or elsewhere. The French minister in America has notified, that Cape François and Port-au-Prince are the only two ports into which merchant ships, of any kind, are allowed to enter, and that it is necessary for American ships, bound even to those ports, to have, from him or his agents, a certificate or passport, importing that the intention of the navigator is not to supply the *rebels*; for so the followers of our new friend Buonaparté denominate the followers of our old friend Toussaint. This was a measure to be expected: it has nothing in it contrary to the usual conduct of nations in similar cases; but it may serve to blast the hopes of those, who place reliance on the eternal warfare, which they think Toussaint will be able to wage against his assailants. Without a supply of ammunition and provisions it is impossible that the Black army should long resist; and if the French hold the sea ports, it is equally impossible that the Blacks should receive that supply.

The election of Buonaparté as Consul for *life*, and the ulterior measure of proclaiming him *Emperor of the Gauls*, with the hereditary right to that title in his family, appear, from our foreign intelligence, to be objects which are in a fair way of being accomplished. What the consequences of this bold step may be, to Buonaparté himself, it is impossible to tell. If the French, on the one hand, behold themselves placed under the despotic sway of a low-bred foreigner, they will, on the other, see with no small gratification, that the advancement of that foreigner extends the power and the predominance of their country. National glory

is the ruling passion in every Frenchman's breast (would to God it were so in the breasts of Englishmen!), and we may rest assured that they will, as they hitherto have done, set at nought every consideration that stands in competition with that glory: so that they are the masters of the world, they care but very little whose slaves they themselves are, or how miserable and uncertain is the life that they lead.

We should suppose, too, that the friends of the lawful sovereign would aid, with all their influence, the intended exaltation of Buonaparté. It would be much easier for a Bourbon to succeed to the throne, vacated by the death of an usurper; it would be much easier even to snatch the reins from his hands, than to raise the throne upon an existing Republic. The Emperor of the Gauls will eradicate the last remaining roots of the regicide principle of republicanism, and when that is done, the road to restoration is by no means rugged.

But, what will be the consequences to the world, and to England in particular, if this stretch of ambition should be attended with success? And is it to Englishmen a subject of sorrow or of joy? To every republican in England, to every citizen of the world, to every philanthropist, to every puritan, to every king-killer, it is a subject of grief the most poignant: what it is to men of a different sort need not to be described. For our parts, we most heartily rejoice at the prospect of seeing Buonaparté an emperor or a king; for, from the moment that he assumes a title common to the lawful monarch of the earth, from that moment are we united against him. The loyal subjects of our sovereign are ever ready to oppose the power of France, be her ruler who he may; but, there is another description of his subjects, in whose discriminating minds, in whose philanthropic breasts, there lives no hostility except to the persons and the families of monarchs; they, gentle souls, would never make war upon their "fellow men," never would they shed a drop of blood that issued not through a royal vestment, never cut off a head unencircled by a crown. They would give up honours and power; they would yield commerce and colonies; they would surrender England itself, rather than imbrue their hands in the blood of their *fellow creatures*: but, let a *king* attempt to encroach upon us, and they will exterminate the whole human race rather than cede us a rock, which the waves may have severed from one of our islands.

For these reasons it is that we view the ambitious strides of Buonaparté, not only without dread, but with delight. We see the possibility of its operating as a consolidation of his power, and of that power passing into the hands of the House of Bourbon, from whom England has certainly no right to expect forbearance; but let us have a king, and, if it be God's will, a *lawful* king, of France to contend with, and we fear not the result. Disarm our enemy of the spell by which he unstrings our nerves, let it be a fair competition of blows, and if he deals us harder than we return, why then let him triumph.

If there be any one, who doubts the correctness of these opinions, let him take a retrospective view of the change in the sentiments of the people of England as far back as the year 1776. At that disgraceful epoch, for the first time, did Englishmen openly wish success to the enemies of their country; to men who were, no matter on what ground, fighting against the armies of their sovereign. France ranged herself under the banners of the Americans; it was impossible to wish success to one, without extending that wish to the other; the cause of *liberty*, dear liberty! which is a bird of all climates, was the pretext; and thus, by degrees, were we prepared to behold without horror the unnatural partiality for France, which, to a great extent, prevailed during the whole of the late contest. To come closer to the present period, let any one examine, if he can find them, the pages of the Morning Chronicle, for instance, for the last ten years. He will there find, that, the friendship of that paper to France has constantly diminished or increased in the exact degree in which her government has grown more monarchical or democratical. It has been, for some time past, looking at "the child and champion of Jacobinism" (to borrow a happy denomination from Mr. Pitt) with a wary and a jealous eye. It has very lately termed him a tyrant, though his government is an elysium compared with that of the Convention: and should he be Emperor of the Gauls, it will hate him as cordially as we do.

Poor Switzerland seems to be fast approaching to its fate, that is, to form a province or two of the Empire of the Gauls. Neither do we here see a subject of very deep regret, provided always that Buonaparté wears a *crown*. The Swiss nation has, by all the canting philanthropists of modern times, been held forth as a pattern of inno-

cence and virtue, and their government as the model of perfection Never let it be forgotton, however, that Necker, Clavière, and Marat, issued forth from those innocent cantons, and still less let it be forgotten, that the government of Switzerland was the standard, to which every regicide politician triumphantly referred. In short, the throne, on which God has placed our Sovereign, and our own prosperity, freedom and public happiness, which have no other basis but that throne, are our first and greatest care; and, as their durability essentially depends upon the destruction of the republican principle, the first wish of our heart is, that that nefarious principle should be radically destroyed.

ACATUS's *favour is received, and we regret that it came too late for insertion in the present Number.—Several other articles are also omitted.—They shall all appear in our next.—X. will be so good as to close his article by Tuesday, if possible.*

☞ *Complete sets of this work may be had by applying to any of the newsmen, or of Messrs. Cobbett and Morgan, Pall Mall.*

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS.

Downing Street, May 14, 1802.

The King has been pleased to appoint the Honourable George Vere Hobart to be Lieutenant-Governor of the Island of Grenada, and its Dependencies, in the room of Alexander Houstoun, Esq. resigned.

Whitehall, May 12, 1802.

The King has been pleased to order a Congé d'Elire to pass the Great Seal, empowering the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral Church of Wells, to elect a Bishop of the See of Bath and Wells, void by the Death of the Right Reverend Father in God Doctor Charles Moss; and his Majesty has also been pleased to recommend the Right Reverend Father in God Doctor Richard Beadon, Bishop of Gloucester, to be by them elected Bishop of that See.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

Births.—Saturday se'nnight, in Conduit-street, the Right Hon. Lady Frances Moreton, of a son and heir.—On Saturday morning, at her house in Soho Square, Mrs. White, widow of the late John White, Esq. of the House of Commons, of a son.

Deaths.—At Dover, at John Trevanion's, Esq. Miss Boyd, sister of Sir John Boyd, Bart. of Dawson, in the county of Kent.—At Berwick-upon-Tweed, aged 72, Mrs. Elizabeth Renwick, daughter of the late Sir William Purvis, of Purvis-Hall, Bart. and niece of the late Earl of Marchmont.

PRICES OF THE PUBLIC FUNDS.

	SAT.	MON.	TUE.	WED.	THU.	FRI
Bank Stock	—	—	190⅜	—	199¼	199
3 per Cent Red. Ann.	73⅝	—	73½	73⅜	73⅜	73⅜
3 per Cent Consols..	74⅜	—	74½	74⅜	74⅜	74⅜
4 per Cent Consols..	90¼	—	90	89⅝	89½	89⅝
5 per Cent Ann.....	102⅜	—	102¼	102⅜	102⅜	102⅜
Imp. 3 per Cent Ann.	72	—	72	71⅞	71⅞	72
5 per Cent. 1797....	103⅞	—	103¼	103½	103⅜	103⅜
Bank Long Ann....	20⅞	—	20⅜	20⅜	20⅜	20⅜
Bank Short Ann....	5	—	5	5	5	5
India Stock.....	—	—	219¼	—	—	219¼
Omnium.....	1½	—	1⅝	1⅝	1½	1
Exch. Bills, New...	—	—	—	—	—	2
Irish 5 per Cent....	100¼	—	—	—	99⅞	—

AMERICAN STOCKS.—Eight pr. c. 113¼.
FRENCH STOCKS.—Tiers Consolidé, 57 f.

LONDON COURSE OF EXCHANGE.

AMSTER. c.f.	10 14 2 us.	LEGHORN	51¼
D°, at sight	10 11	NAPLES.....	44
ROTTERDAM.	10 15 2 us.	GENOA	47¼
HAMBURGH..	32 7 2½ us.	LISBON.....	68
ALTONA	32 8 2½ us.	OPORTO	68½
PARIS 2 us ..	23 14 liv.	DUBLIN.....	12¼
BOURDEAUX, d°	23 15	VENICE, 59 livres piccole effective per £. ster.	
CADIZ	34½ in paper	BILBOA.....	37 D°
DITTO	36½ effective	PALERMO	
MADRID ..	34½ in paper	AGIO, bank on Hol.	p.
DITTO	37¼ effective		

PRICES CURRENT IN LONDON.

	s.	s.		s.	d.
Eng. Wheat per q.	52	to 67	Hops per cwt...	84	to 144
Foreign.....	40	.. 66	Hay per load	38	.. 84
Rye.....	32	.. 36	Beef, per stone....	5s. 10d. to 6s. 6d.	
Barley.....	30	.. 35			
Malt.....	40	.. 50	Mutton	6s.	to 7s.
Oats	15	.. 25	Veal	6s.	to 7s.
Pease.....	30	.. 36	Pork....	5s. 4d.	to 6s. 8d.
Beans.....	30	.. 39	Tallow	4s.	1d.
Flour per sack ..	45	.. 50	Average of Sugar per cwt.	37s.	3d.
Seconds.....	40	.. 45			
Coals per chal....	32	.. 40			

Bread *Nine Pence Farthing* the Quartern Loaf.
Porter Four Pence Halfpenny per Pot.

OBSERVATIONS ON THE WEATHER,

Near Guildford, in Surrey, for the Month of March, 1802.

Days.	M's Age	Weather.	Winds. M.	Winds. A.	Barometer. Inches. M.	Barometer. Inches. A.	Thermometer. Degrees. M.	Thermometer. Degrees. A.
13		Fine.	NW	NW	29,84	29,83	50	52
14		*Snow* Fair	NW	NW	29,91	29,9	46	51
15		Fair Rain	NW	NW	29,8	29,8	48	49
16		Fair.	N	NW	29,8	29,82	46	46
17	○	Rain Fair	NW	NW	29,81	29,8	49	48
18		Fair.	NW	NW	29,85	29,86	45,7	51
19		Rain.	S	SW	29,48	29,55	48	53

● *New Moon* ☾ *1st. Quar.* ○ *F. Moon.* ☽ *last Quar.*

Printed by Cox and Baylis, No. 75, Great Queen Street, Lincoln's Inn Fields.
Published by R. Bagshaw, Bow Street, Covent Garden, where all the former numbers may be had.